UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,362	09/08/2003	Vijay Anand Saraswat		2109

7590 10/23/2006

Vijay Anand Saraswat
208 Morris Avenue
Mountain, NJ 07046

EXAMINER	
VUU, HENRY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,362	SARASWAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Vuu	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 September 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/8/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "comprises or associated with" renders the claim to be indefinite in terms of whether the second visual card "comprises" or is "associated" with an event handler, wherein the terminology "comprises" includes the event handler and "associated with" does not.

Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 refers to "said card" in which it is unclear whether "said card" refers to a first visual card or a second visual card.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14,15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ativanichayaphong et al. (Patent No. 7,032,169).

As to independent claim 1, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

A method of navigating multi-modal content (see e.g., col. 5, lines 17 – 31)) comprising: receiving, in a visual browser (visual browser – see e.g., col. 4, line 17), an indication that a user has selected a link (see e.g., col. 6, line 55 – 57) on a first visual card (see e.g., www.w3schools.com/wap/wml_format.asp and col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., www.w3schools.com defines a card within a WML deck as "A card element can contain text, markup, links, input-fields, tasks, images, etc.", wherein the link displayed on visual browser 130 corresponds to the element within the first visual card); in response to said indication, pointing said visual browser to a second visual card (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., the link associated with the first visual card corresponds to a pointer that points to a second visual card), whereby the pointing of said visual browser to said second visual card constitutes a forward entry into said second visual card (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., visual browser 130 visits the URL associated with the link selected by the user on the fist visual card); in response to said forward entry into said second visual card, initiating a voice call (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., a covisit attribute containing the desired voice page can be added to the second visual card using an HTML form or anchor tag to initiate a voice call); contacting

an update host (see e.g., col. 5, lines 42 – 45; i.e., the update host corresponds to the internal synchronization table 110 and 115 residing in browser coordinator 105, which is used to reference URL 140 and 140A); receiving, from said update host, information indicative of content; and pointing said visual browser in accordance with the received information (see e.g., col. 56 – 67; i.e., referenced URL 140 and 140A correspond to visual markup language 145 and voice markup language 145A respectively, and are processed by browser coordinator 105 which provide each document to the appropriate browser).

As to dependent claim 4, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein said second visual card comprises, or is associated with (see e.g., col. 7, line 48 – 67; i.e., the second visual card corresponds to "mainmenu.html", which is a pointer or link to the main menu of a visual or voice browser), an event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler corresponds to the "href" tag for "mainmenu.html" and "mainmenu.vxml") which is actuated upon forward entry into said second visual card (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the "href" tags is actuated upon the users forward interaction with the "mainmenu.html" link, which synchronizes the visual and voice browsers), and wherein said act of initiating a voice call is performed by said event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the "href" event handler includes the extension ".vxml", which is an indication and a reference to a document that supports voice calls).

As to dependent claim 5, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein the received information (see e.g., col. 8, lines 30 – 62; i.e., the received information corresponds to the voice markup document that is provided to the voice browser) comprises an indication of a page and card to which said visual browser should be pointed (see e.g., Fig. 2 and col. 8, lines 30 – 62; i.e., the browser coordinator 105 includes synchronization table 110 and 115, which indicate and point to a URL corresponding to a page and a card for a visual or voice browser), and wherein the act of pointing said visual browser in accordance with the received information comprises: pointing the visual browser to said card within said page (browser coordinator 105 – see e.g., Fig. 2).

As to dependent claim 6, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

The method of claim 5, further comprising: loading said page (see e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 12; i.e., the VoiceXML content is loaded) prior to pointing the visual browser to said card (see e.g., col. 9, line 30 – 62; i.e., after the VoiceXML is loaded and browser coordinator 105 stores the attributes and co-attributes into synchronization table 115).

As to independent claim 7, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

A computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41) having data encoded thereon (computer program – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41) which is interpretable by a browser (see e.g., col. 8, lines 19 – 41; i.e., the conversion and reproduction corresponds to the browser's ability to reproduce and convert program codes for proper display on the visual or voice browser), the data comprising: an update card (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., the update

card corresponds to steps 435 and 440) comprising: a first event handler which initiates a voice call (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler "mainmenu.vxml" within synchronization table 110 initiates a voice call when file extension ".vxml" is located, which allows the user to vocally select a choice), said first event handler being actuatable upon a forward entry into said update card (see e.g., col. 8, lines 1 – 12); and a second event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 61 – 67; i.e., the event handler corresponds to the "mainmenu.html", which when initiated, contacts browser coordinator 105) which initiates a contact to an update site which provides the browser with information concerning a location to which to point the browser (see e.g., col. 7, lines 61 – 67; i.e., browser coordinator 105 is a table that provides the visual or voice browser with information concerning a pointer location); and a content card comprising: a link which is selectable by a user who views said content card with the browser (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67).

As to independent claim 14, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

A system for facilitating multi-modal interaction with content comprising (system 100 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 53 – 67; i.e., system 100 facilitates the presentation of multi-modal electronic content): a network interface (computer communication network – see e.g., col. 5, lines 17 – 32) which communicatively connects the system to a personal communication device (see e.g., col. 5, lines 17 – 32; i.e., the personal communication device corresponds to visual browser 130 and voice browser 135); a processor (computer system – see e.g., col. 11, lines 19 – 30; i.e., a processor is incorporated into a computer system to execute

computer instructions); first programming which executes on said processor (see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41; i.e., the program is executed by the computer system), said first programming being adapted to provide information to said personal communication device through said network interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 19 – 30; i.e., the program loaded by the computer system provides the method of providing information to visual browser 130 and voice browser 135, in which the computers can be distributed), said information being indicative of content to which a visual browser executing on said personal communication device is to be pointed (see e.g., col. 7, lines 61 – 67; i.e., browser coordinator 105 is a table that provides the visual or voice browser with information concerning a pointer location).

As to dependent claim 15, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

The system of claim 14, further comprising: second programming, which executes on said processor (see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41; the second programming corresponds to a set of instructions), which determines a location to which a user has navigated (browser coordinator 105 – see e.g., col. 5, lines 33 – 44; i.e., browser coordinator 105 is a table that stores the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) in order to determine a location to which the user has navigated) using a visual browser (visual browser 130 – see e.g., col. 5, lines 33 – 44), and which communicates said location to said first programming (see e.g., Fig. 2 and col. 7, lines 48 - 67; i.e., the location are stored in synchronization table 110, 115, 120, and 125 of browser coordinator 105, which is passed to the first program),

wherein the information provided by said first programming is based on the location determined by said second programming (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67).

As to dependent claim 17, Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches:

The system of claim 14, wherein the provision of said information by said first programming is actuated by said visual browser (visual browser 130 – see e.g., col. 4, lines 53 – 67) generating a Hypertext Transport Protocol (HTTP) (see e.g., Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition and col. 5, lines 1 – 17; i.e., HTTP is defined as "the protocol used to carry requests from a browser to a Web server and to transport pages from Web servers back to the requesting browser", therefore browser 130 and 135 are configured to receive and deliver Web content) request comprising a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (URL 140 – see e.g., col. 5, lines 17 – 32) which identifies, or is associated with, the system (system 100 – see e.g., Fig.1 and col. 4, lines 53 – 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> **(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.**

Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ativanichayaphong et al. (Patent No. 7,032,169) in view of Werner et al. (Pub No. 2003/0171925).

As to dependent claim 2, claim 2 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a second visual card (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., the link associated with the first visual card corresponds to a pointer that points to a second visual card) that is associated with an update host (see e.g., the update host corresponds to the internal synchronization table residing in browser coordinator 105), but does not teach termination of a voice call, and an event handler that is actuated upon backward entry during the termination of a voice call. Werner et al. teaches an event handler (see e.g., para. [0214]; i.e., the "goback VoiceXML" event element corresponds to the event handler) that is actuated upon backward entry (see e.g., para. [0214]; i.e., when the user says "go-back", a goback VoiceXML event handler is initialized) during the termination of a voice call (see e.g., para. [0199]; i.e., after the termination of second voice call, the user initiates event handler "goback" to add an additional order to the original order). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second visual card associated with an update host of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the event handler that is actuated upon backward entry during the termination of a voice call of Werner et al. because the request for the backward entry script allows the voice browser to automatically transition to the previous state of the script (see e.g., para. [0008]; i.e., upon invoking the "goback" event handler, the voice browser automatically transitions to the previous state, including all the previous entered information).

As to dependent claim 8, claim 8 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41), wherein the browser (visual browser 130 – see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67) is adapted to place a first voice call (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., a covisit attribute containing the desired voice page can be added to the second visual card using an HTML form or anchor tag to initiate a voice call) in response to instructions (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., the instructions corresponds to the application developer adding a covisit attribute containing the URL of the desired voice page) contained in a card (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., the card containing the instructions corresponds to the link in visual browser 130), but does not each an event handler that is initiated by a backward entry and termination of the first voice call. Werner et al. teaches an event handler (see e.g., para. [0214]; i.e., the "goback VoiceXML" event element corresponds to the event handler) that is actuated upon backward entry (see e.g., para. [0214]; i.e., when the user says "go-back", a goback VoiceXML event handler is initialized) during the termination of a voice call (see e.g., para. [0199]; i.e., after the termination of second voice call, the user initiates event handler "goback" to add an additional order to the original order). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second visual card associated with an update host of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the event handler that is actuated upon backward entry during the termination of a voice call of Werner et al. because the request for the backward entry script allows the

voice browser automatically transitions to the previous state of the script (see e.g., para. [0008]; i.e., upon invoking the "goback" event handler, the voice browser automatically transitions to the previous state, including all the previous entered information).

Claims 3, 9, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ativanichayaphong et al. (Patent No. 7,032,169) in view of Praitis et al. (Patent No. 6,594,697).

As to dependent claim 3, claim 3 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a second visual card (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 67; i.e., the link associated with the first visual card corresponds to a pointer that points to a second visual card), and contacting an update host (see e.g., col. 5, lines 42 – 45; i.e., the update host corresponds to the internal synchronization table 110 and 115 residing in browser coordinator 105, which is used to reference URL 140 and 140A and updating the pointer location), but does not teach an event handler which is actuated upon expiration of a timer that comprises starting a timer set to expire at a predetermined amount of time and contacting an update host initiated by the event handler due to time expiration. Praitis et al. teaches an event handler (408 Request Time-out – see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9), which is actuated upon expiration of a timer (see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9; i.e., the user did not respond to the server within a predefined period of time, causing an event handler to occur), that comprises starting a timer (see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9; i.e., the server has a predefined timer that is

initialized at the beginning of each session). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second visual card of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the timer and event handler of Praitis et al. because Praitis's user friendly error message presents possible solutions that enables a user to prevent future errors (see e.g., col.2, lines 36 – 46).

As to dependent claim 9, claim 9 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41), wherein the first event handler initiating a first voice call (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler "mainmenu.vxml" within synchronization table 110 initiates a voice call when file extension ".vxml" is located, which allows the user to vocally select a choice), and a second event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 61 – 67; i.e., the event handler corresponds to the "mainmenu.html", which when initiated, contacts browser coordinator 105), but does not teach the first event handler initiating a timer and the second event handler is initiated by an\ time expiration. Praitis et al. teaches a first event handler initiating a timer (see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9; i.e., the timer is initiated at the beginning of the session) and a second event handler that is actuated during an expiration of a timer (see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second visual card of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the timer and event handler of Praitis et al.

because Praitis's user friendly error message presents possible solutions that enables a user to prevent future errors (see e.g., col.2, lines 36 – 46).

As to dependent claim 10, claim 10 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 9 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41), wherein the first event handler initiating a first voice call (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler "mainmenu.vxml" within synchronization table 110 initiates a voice call when file extension ".vxml" is located, which allows the user to vocally select a choice) and a link (see e.g., col. 6, line 55 – 57) but does not teach a variable and timer to expire in the future indicated by a variable. Praitis et al. teaches a variable (408 Request Time-out – see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9; i.e., 408 Request Time-out is a variable assigned to a handler that corresponds to the client not responding) and a timer to expire in the future (see e.g., col. 8, lines 7 – 9; i.e., the 408 Request Time-out is a timer set to expire within a predetermined time due to the client not producing a timely request or response). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the second visual card of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the timer and event handler of Praitis et al. because Praitis's user friendly error message presents possible solutions that enables a user to prevent future errors (see e.g., col.2, lines 36 – 46).

As to dependent claim 11, claim 11 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 9 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41),

wherein the browser (browser – see e.g., col. 2, line 27 – 39) is adapted to create a new thread for the placement of a voice call (see e.g., col. 8, lines 3 – 53), but does not teach the browser continuing instructions contained in the data following the creation of the new thread regardless of whether the voice call has been completed. Praitis et al. teaches the browser continuing instructions contained in the data (see e.g., col. 10, lines 44 – 51; i.e., the browser continues with other tasks such as displaying the selected page). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the browser adapted to create a new thread for the placement of a voice call of Ativanichayaphong et al. the continuation of data of Praitis et al. because the browser is allowed to wait for the next request from the user if now errors occurred (see e.g., col. 10, lines 44 – 51).

Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ativanichayaphong et al. (Patent No. 7,032,169) in view of Lucassen et al (Patent No. 6,996,800).

As to dependent claim 12, claim 12 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a computer-readable medium (computer program product – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41) having data encoded (computer program – see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41), an update card (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., the update card corresponds to steps 435 and 440), a first event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler "mainmenu.vxml" within synchronization table 110 initiates a voice call when file

extension ".vxml" is located, which allows the user to vocally select a choice), a second event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 61 – 67; i.e., the event handler corresponds to the "mainmenu.html", which when initiated, contacts browser coordinator 105), but does not teach the browser being a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) browser, and the instructions are in the form of Wireless Markup Language (WML). Lucassen et al. teaches a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) browser (see e.g., col. 7, lines 26 – 56) and instructions in the form of Wireless Markup Language (see e.g., col. 17, lines 4 – 29). Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computer-readable medium, first event handler, second event handler, and content card of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) and Wireless Markup Language (WML) of Lucassen et al. because the customization and specialization method used in Lucassen's invention allows optimization of an application for a given channel, such as fragmenting a WML document across multiple decks of cards (see e.g., col. 17, lines 4 – 29).

As to dependent claim 16, claim 16 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 14 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a system for facilitating multi-modal interaction with content comprising (system 100 – see e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 53 – 67; i.e., system 100 facilitates the presentation of multi-modal electronic content), a network interface (computer communication network – see e.g., col. 5, lines 17 – 32), a processor (computer system – see e.g., col. 11, lines 19 – 30; i.e., a processor is incorporated into a computer

system to execute computer instructions) and a first program (see e.g., col. 11, lines 31 – 41; i.e., the program is executed by the computer system), but does not teach a wireless telephone. Lucassen et al. teaches wireless telephones (cellular phone –see e.g., col. 17, lines 4 – 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system for facilitating multi-modal interaction of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the cellular phone of Lucassen et al. because customization and specialization is a method that cab optimize an application for a class of channels (see e.g., col. 17, lines 4 – 29).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ativanichayaphong et al. (Patent No. 7,032,169) in view of Kishida et al. (Pub No. 2004/0208167).

As to dependent claim 13, this claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above. Ativanichayaphong et al. teaches a first event handler (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67; i.e., the event handler "mainmenu.vxml" within synchronization table 110) and an action associated with a link (col. 6, line 55), which comprises an instruction to place a voice call (see e.g., col. 7, lines 48 – 67 and col. 8, lines 1 - 2; i.e., when the user selects the hyperlink, which corresponds to an instruction to place a voice call, the mainmenu.vxml extension is located in order to initiate a voice call) to a number (see e.g., Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition and col. 7, lines 23 – 34; i.e., a URL is defined as "the protocol to be used in accessing the resource, name of the server, and the

path to a resource", wherein the URL consist of Internet Protocol (IP) numbers or addresses that point to a specified Web content) specified at a variable (see e.g., col. 7, lines 23 – 34; i.e., the variable corresponds to the URL), but does not teach setting the variable to a telephone number. Kishida et al. teaches setting a variable to a telephone number (see e.g., para. [0089]; i.e., the Internet telephone service provider assigns a telephone number to an Internet Protocol (IP) address, and recorded in a database). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the event handler, link, voice call, and variable of Ativanichayaphong et al. with the Internet service provider providing a database for the Internet Protocol (IP) address and telephone number of Kishida et al. because the relationship between the Internet Protocol (IP) address and the telephone number allows the Internet service provider to search the database for a targeted party based on the relationship (see e.g., para. [0089]).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 7,050,905 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Nemeth et al. teaches. Wireless Markup Language (WML) cards or decks that are displayed on a wireless device with updating feature.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Pub No. 2003/0130854 can be applicable and

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Galanes et al. teaches a multi-modal device with voice and visual capabilities, and features including even handlers for audio and visual prompting.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 6,430,624 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Jamtgaard et al. teaches a first and second card within a deck within a wireless device using a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Vuu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1048. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Examiner's Name: HENRY VUU

Examiner's Initials: H.V.

Examiner's Signature: Henry

Date: 9/28/2006

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/1/06